Scott. 11-29—35,006—2-11-26.

Revenue (1927) Department.

Mis. SERIES.

G.O. No. 865

DATED 7 5 1927

[Despatch Abstract.]

Settlement - Re-settlement - South Kanara - Kumeri lands - Orders passed.

ASST. SECRETARIAT REVENUE 2800 26

Rev 2821.E
Rp. 28.10.26

Revenue Department.

Subject.

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara - Kumaki lands.

Reference No.F-5868/26.1,

M a d r a s. Dated the 25th October 1926.

From

W. SCOTT BROWN, ESQUIRE, I.C.S.,

Secretary, Board of Revenue,

Land Revenue and Settlement.

--

N.Macmichael Esquire, C.S.I., I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue and Settlement.

::

P.L.Moore Esquire, C.I.E., I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.

--

Read the following papers:--

Pp 5-7 below

Letter from G.S.Bozman Esquire, I.C.S. Acting Special Settlement Officer, Party No.IV, Trichinopoly, R.O.C.No.225/B & C/25, dated the 29th June 1926.

II

Pp 7-8 below

Letter from G.W.Wells Esquire, M.A., I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara, Ref.C.No.5396/26-A.2, dated the 25th August 1926.

**

REFERENCE.

In his letter read above the Special Settlement Officer No.IV Party states that the existence of Kumaki privileges causes considerable complication in the Revenue accounts, that it involves extra work for the Survey and Settlement Departments and that it necessitates annual inspection by the revenue officials to see whether any crops has been raised on kumaki lands. He therefore proposes that these lands may be assessed at a flat rate of annas 4 per acre and included in patta. The Collector, however, observes that the weight of public opinion is against the assessment of kumaki lands and points out that so long as the lands are

retained

retained as kumaki, they will be available for assignment to members of the depressed classes or to ex-military men. It is quite clear that the existence of the kumaki privilege - causes much inconvenience to the revenue administration, but it is equally clear that anything like a general assessment of kumaki lands would raise a storm of protest. Government have complete control over these lands as is evidenced by the legal decisions quoted in paragraph 5 of the Special Settlement - Officer's letter and the present position is that if any - - kumaki land is applied for by a member of the depressed - - classes, or by anybody else, the adjoining wargdar has either to acquiesce in such assignment or himself take up the land at the full settlement rate. This being the case, the Board considers that an attempt might be made to induce the wargdars to take up their adjoining kumaki lands on patta at a favourable rate, such privilege being offered only for a limited time. If the wargdar declines the offer, he will be no worse off than at present. If, however, he accepts it, he will - have the advantage of obtaining the land at less than the - settlement rate of assessment and of preventing the possibility of the land getting into the hands of an outsider. If the - position is explained to representative wargdars they might - appreciate the advantage of taking up kumaki lands on patta and if the idea caught on, it might be possible to get rid of a considerable area of such lands and thus simplify the work of the Revenue Department.

The Board desires to have the opinion of the Collector on this suggestion.

W Scott Brown 27/10

Secretary.

To the Collector of South Kanara.
Copy to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Special Settlement Officer, No.IV Party.

- - - -

C.N.N./26-10-1926.

Copy of letter from G.S.Bozman Esquire, I.C.S., Acting Special Settlement Officer, Party No.IV, Trichinopoly, R.O. No.225/B & C/25, dated the 29th June 1926.

Settlement - Resettlement - Kumaki lands.

(M) B.P.Misc., No.163 dated the 22nd January 1926 - paragraph 1.

The Board has called for a report on the question whether the privilege now enjoyed on Kumaki lands may not be discontinued at the coming re-settlement.

2. The privilege as at present enjoyed consists in the Kumakidar being allowed to use any growth on his kumaki land as manure for his wet fields. If he raises any ordinary dry cultivation on the kumaki it is treated as constructive darkhast and the land assigned to him at the suitable dry rate. If he allows any other person to raise cultivation on his kum that also is normally treated as a surrender of his privilege and the land is assigned to the occupier. So long as the land is used solely as kumaki, the kumakidar pays no assessme for it.

3. As the kumaki privilege applies only to kadim lands which are mixed up anyhow with hosagamme lands, it is obvious that it must cause considerable complication of the accounts and that its continuance will also continue that complication. It will also mean that the surveyors have a good deal of extr work to do. The dry lands bordering the stretches of wet cu tivation will have to be split up into patches of alternating kumaki and ordinary assessed waste, according as the adjoinin wet land is kadim or hosagamme. Even if it is not considere necessary to sub-divide the land in this way - at present the survey are making such sub-divisions - it will necessitate a separate remark or entry in the land register, rough patta, fair patta and Settlement Register for each kadim land

4. The whole question as to how these lands might be dealt with is considered fully in B.P.No.217 dated the 15th June 1906. I doubt if there is much to be added to the facts stated and the proposals made by the Collector at that time. It was reported that 449, 291 acres were then kumaki. I am told that since then a considerable proportion has been taken up on darkhast but there must still be a large area which pays no assessment. If a small flat rate is fixed for all kumaki lands, it would result in a very noticeable increase in revenue and would, I should say, cause not the slightest real hardship. I have received rather conflicting accounts of the value which the ryots attach to the privilege and I am not sufficiently acquainted with the district to have been able to form any opinion of my own. The Collector will be able to deal with this aspect of the question.

5. It is a fact that kumaki land is rarely used for anything but kumaki purposes except that there is a growing tendency, according to my information, to plant them up with cashew-nut trees which are said to be a profitable crop; and there would probably be objections raised on that ground. But the Kans in Uppinangadi taluk, which are essentially the same thing, pay a flat rate of 4 annas whether cultivated or not and there is no difficulty in collecting the assessment. It has also been made abundantly clear, both in the B.P. referred to in paragraph 4 above and in the following decisions - I.L.R.16 - Madras, 304, I.L.R. Madras 12-422, followed in I.L.R. 28 - Madras at page 287 - S.A.36/1886 (un-reported) - followed in I.L.R.28 - Madras - pages 287 and 288, that Government have surrendered no part of their right in these lands.

6. I would therefore propose that a flat rate of four annas be imposed on all kumaki lands and an ordinary revenue patta issued for them. The distinction between kadim and osagamne could then be abolished and the kumaki privilege as such would disappear. It would also do away with the necessity for annual inspection to see whether any crop had been

raised on the kumaki. Where the kumaki has already been enclosed with a fence or a wall, the extent actually enclosed may be - - assigned to the kumakidar free of any tree value or, if the kumakidar is not willing to take it on those terms, to any other person on payment of tree value. This would apply so long as no part of the enclosure had been brought to B.Memo. Where the land has not been enclosed a sub-division, roughly 100 yards in depth and co-extensive with the adjoining boundary of the kadim land, should be measured and demarcated and assigned on the above terms. If these proposals or proposals similar to these are approved, the public announcement could be made so as to give kumakidars plenty of time to make up their minds whether they would or would not take the land before the re-settlement is actually due. The measurement could then be done by the Survey Party working in the District and the ~~enquiry~~ enquiry into registry could be made either by the Surveyors - as under the present scheme for re-settlements or by the Settlement staff which will be engaged upon collection of statistics for a scheme report.

7. I have not here dealt with the probable cost of such - operations as it would be futile to do so without knowing whether they should be carried out by the Survey Department, the Settlement Department or possibly the Revenue Department. The figures given in the Collector's letter No.Dis.704-R/ver., dated the 14th December 1905 quoted in the B.P. referred to in paragraph 4 above will be of little value now as the standard of wages has changed. Also some of the staff which he then considered necessary might already be - on hand with the settlement party. But at a rough estimate I should say that the capital expenditure involved would be completely recovered in the form of additional revenue in two or three years and possibly less.

Copy of letter from G.W.Wells Esquire, M.A., I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara, Ref.C.No.5396/26-A.2, dated the 27th August 1926.

The Special Settlement Officer's letter referred to above is herewith submitted. On receipt of this letter, I asked certain Divisional Officers and Tahsildars to obtain the views of the leading ryots within their jurisdiction on the subject and submit them to me with their opinions. The weight of public opinion is against the assessment of kumaki lands and the opinions, I think, are sufficiently representative to deserve reppect. Even those who are in favour of assessing kumakis at a flat rate say that it should not exceed two annas per acre, that there should be no charge for the tree-growth on the land and that the assessment should not be enhanced at subsequent re-settlements.

2. The opinion of some previous Collectors was that - Kumaki lands should be included in the pattas of the kumakidars at a uniform rate of annas four per acre. But the Government in their order No.513 Revenue, dated the 8th June 1906 communicated with B.P.No.217 Revenue Settlement Land Records and Agriculture dated the 15th June 1906 held that the Settlement of kumaki lands was unnecessary and that land holders might continue to - enjoy the use of their kumaki lands under the rules approved in G.O.No.302 dated the 1st July 1896.

3. It is a fact that cashew trees are grown in some kumakis and some profits may be derived by the kumakidars from these trees. But I doubt whether this kind of cultivation can be charged any assessment as the income derived therefrom is uncertain. Should there be any extensive and deliberate cultivation of cashew trees in kumakis for commercial purposes it would then be time to insist on the parties taking them on assignment at the full appropriate rate of assessment.

4. In view of the strong public opinion against the assessment of kumaki lands, it is not desirable to proceed to the assessment of them. Moreover, while they are retained as kumaki they will be a sort of reserve upon which Government can draw in case of sheer necessity for assignment to the depressed classes and - Ex-military men.

C.W. 31

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

CURRENT No. 537 E

Received ..... 192 *Registered* 8-2-27 192

Subject.

Settlement- Resettlement- South Kanara- Kumaki lands.

ENCLOSURES
No.....
.....
Spare copies.....

Reference.. No.F 5868/26-2

Station Madras, *Dated the* 5th February '27 ~~192~~

From

Land Revenue, and
The Board of Revenue, ~~Revenue~~ Settlement, ~~etc.~~
~~Separate Revenue.~~

N. Macmichael Esq., C.S.I., I.C.S.,
Commr.of Land Revenue & Sett.

~~Resolution~~
Reference.

H.A.B. Vernon Esq., I.C.S.,
Commr.of Land Revenue.

Read the following paper:-

Letter from G.W. Wells Esq., M.A.,I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara, No.R.Dis. 9116-26 dated the 26th December '26:-

Board's reference No. F 5868-26-1, dated 25th October 1926.

On receipt of the Board's reference quoted above, the Divisional officers were asked to hold meetings of Wargdars

of their divisions and to explain to them the Board's suggestions. I myself held a meeting at Kasaragod on the 20th instant. There were about 40 land holders present.

2. From the present Board's reference it is seen that the proposal is to include kumaki in patta at a flat rate of assessment only at resurvey. It is not clear whether the intention of the Board is that in taluks of which resurvey has not been taken up, the work of assigning kumaki should be undertaken by the Revenue Department in the course of its ordinary darkhast work. If that is the intention and if kumaki is applied for wholesale under the concessions, it may be a great strain on the Revenue Department. If it is to be done only at resurvey, the question is who is to decide disputes regarding apportionment of common kumaki and the like.

3. The position as regards kumaki may be briefly stated as follows:-

(a) kumaki privileges are those defined in rule 7 A of the rules framed under section 26 of the Forest Act.

(b) The kumakidar has ordinarily a preferential claim to the assignment of kumaki.

(c) If the kumaki is assigned to the Kumakidar, no tree value except 2/3 of the value of the sandal wood trees is collected from him.

(d) The legal position that the kumakidar has no legal right to get his kumaki assigned in his name and that no suit can lie against Government for non assignment of Kumaki to the Kumakidar is perfectly clear. Kumaki land is as much land at the disposal of Government as non kumaki land. But the kumakidar is generally allowed to have his kumaki in his name and given preference over others except in the following cases:-

(1) where he has lost his kumaki privilege by adverse possession for more than six months.

(2) where the kumaki land is required for public purposes.

(3) where the kumaki is required for assignment to depressed classes and there is no other suitable land in the village for the purpose.

4. From the Divisional officer's reports and from my personal experience at the meeting held by me at Kasaragod it appears that in all taluks except in Uppinangadi and to some exten in Mangalore the proposal is welcomed and the balance of opinio of the ryots as now ascertained is rather in favour of the proposal than against it. Except probably in the interior villa ges, there will be a large response to the concessions. At the same time it cannot be said that all persons will take up the kumaki voluntarily. In order to do this sufficient time will have to be allowed to the kumakidars to take up their kumaki at the concession rate. I consider that a period of one year will be sufficient if the assignment work is to be don by the ordinary revenue staff.

5. The next question is whether kumaki privileges as now enjoyed should be withdrawn in the case of people who do not avail themselves of the concessions. It is clear that to achieve the full object of the proposal, the kumaki privilege should cease to exist after the concession period of one year As the above rule may work hardship, I think it is sufficient if it is made known that after the period of one year the ~~mukami~~ Kumaki dar as such will not be given any preference over others in the matter of assignments and will have to pay the value of tree growth and the full settlement assessment if he is to get the land himself though in the absence of applications from any body the kumakidar may be allowed to exercise the existing privileges over the kumaki land.

6. In this connection I beg to recommend that the following further concessions may also be given to the ryots who take up the kumaki land within the period allowed to them.

(1) That there be three rates viz. four annas for lands in the first group three annas for those in the second group and two annas for those in the third group which rates represent half of the lowest prevailing rates of assessment.

(2) That the value of sandal wood trees may be remitted in full.

(3) That the concession rates are to be revised only at the settlement after the next.

Reference.-

Submitted to Government in continuation of. Board's reference F 5868/26-1, dated 25th October 1926.

2. Para 2 of the Collector's letter- The agency to be entrusted with the survey and assignment of kumakis.- As the assignment of kumaki lands is likely to raise difficult questions which can be dealt with satisfactorily only by the Revenue officials who possess local experience, the Board considers that all work connected with the assignment of kumakis including the settlement of disputes among the kumakidars should be done by the Revenue Department. The survey of the kumaki lands to be assigned will of course have to be done by the Survey Department.

3. Para 4 of the Collector's letter.- The period within which wargdars should be allowed to take up kumaki lands on patta at a favourable rate.- The Board agrees with the Collector that a period of one year will be sufficient for the purpose. p.11 above.

4. Para 5 of the Collector's letter.- Whether the kumaki privileges should be withdrawn after the said period.- The Board considers that wargdars may be allowed to enjoy kumaki privileges even after the expiry of the period. It should however be announced that after the prescribed period the kumakidars will not be given preference over other applicants and that they will have to pay the full settlement rate (i.e. the lowest dry rate) in case kumaki lands are assigned to them. p.11 above

5. Para 6 of the Collector's letter.-

(i) The rates to be adopted and their liability to revision at future settlements.- The Collector proposes that the rates may be fixed at as. 4, as.3 and as.2 per acre for villages in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd groups respectively, the proposed rates repre-

representing one half of the lowest dry rates prevailing in the respective groups. The Collector has not suggested a rate for kumaki lands in villages placed in the 4th group. The Board considers that the rates may be fixed at as. 4 per acre in villages placed in the first and second groups and at as. 2 per acre in villages of the third and fourth groups.

The Board supports the Collector's proposal that the rate now fixed should be liable to revision only at the settlement after the next. As the current settlement will expire in a few years, it will be felt as a hardship if the rates now imposed, are enhanced at the ensuing resettlement.

(ii) Remission of the value of the sandal wood trees.-

The Chief Conservator of Forests is being consulted and the Board's remarks will be submitted on receipt of reply from that officer.

x

Assistant Secretary. 7/7/44

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Deptt. (paras.1-5).
To the Collector of South Kanara with a copy of the Resolution to be retd. (para 6)
To the Chief Conservator of Forests, para 7 only.

M.D.7-2

46/26-2

Revenue Department.

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara District - Kumaki lands - Bd's Ref.F.5868-26-1, dated 25-10-26.

O.M.No. 2821/E-6 dated 26-2-27.

Issue urgent today
Endsm. page 3 C.F
MP/26.2.27 3.15 pm

In para.4 of his letter dated 27-8-1926 forwarded with the Board's reference read above, the Collector ha stated that while Kumaki lands are re-tained as Kumaki, they will be a sort of reserve upon which the Govt. can draw in case of sheer necessity for assignment to depressed classes and t ex-military men. The Govt. do not understand how Kumaki lands can form reserve of this description as presu-mably the Kumakidar would always pref to take his kumaki land on patta rath than let it be assigned to another and under the existing rules he is to be allowed to exercise this preference.

2. The S.S.O. has stated that the existence of Kumaki involves extra work for the Survey department. The proposa

now under consideration is to assign kumaki lands at a special rate of assessment. It is evident that fields assessed at a special rate will have to be surveyed as subdivisions, distinct from the adjoining waste and patta lands which are not assessed at that special rate. The Govt. therefore do not understand how the proposal will lighten the work of the Surveyors.

The Board's further report promised in para.5(ii) of its Refce.F. 5868-26-2, dated 5-2-27, is awaited.

22/2.27

page 13 C.F.

DE[illegible]ED
16 FEB 1927

To the Board of Revenue, L.R. & S.

[C.No. 2821/E-26] 1-17

Settlement. Resettlement. South Kanara Dt. Kumaki lands.

From the Board of Rev (A.R.S.) F. 5868-26-1 & 25-10-26

To ... Secretary.

The file relates to the question as to ho 'Kumaki lands' in the South Kanara District should be dealt with at the resettlement. They are described as Government waste lands within 100 yards of old warg land (cultivated land) in which the wargdar is allowe to enjoy privileges of grazing cattle, cutting leaves firewood and timber for his own agricultural and domestic purposes. All wargs have not kumaki lands attached. Only wargs formed prior to fasli 1276 are allowed the privilege. Wargs formed subsequently have no kumaki privileges and certain ancient wargs have no kumaki privileges because they are surrounded by other wargs. These privileges are allowed subject to certain rules framed under the Forest Act vide G.O. 302, dated 1-7-1896.

In 1899 the Collector suggested that kumaki privileges should be abolished and that ~~those~~ ryots who wished to retain control over what was their kumaki lands should put in darkhast applications for the land.

Reference was made to this question in the report prepared in 1905 for the introduction of settlement in the district, wherein it was suggested by the S.S.O. that kumaki lands should be assigned to the wargdars subject to assessment at the lowest dry rate of the group, provided that applications were put in within one year: At the end of that time, kumaki lands not taken up by the kumakidars should be available for darkhast at the settlement dry rates.

The Board of Revenue recommended that landholders should be permitted to take up their kumaki lands on darkhast at a rate of 4 annas per acre for

to put up.

302	Pmo	1-7-1896.
757	P.	25-8-1902
1190	P	30-10-1902
218	P	8-3-1905
982	P	9-10-1905
513	P	8-6-1906
2166	P	8-8-1908
2979	P	9-10-1913
3413	P	31-10-1917
1711	P	4-11-1925
98	Pmo	19-1-1926
2045 E-26		1-9-26
954	R1	9-9-26

R

145 (2)

the period of the settlement. The Board suggested a limit of 2 years within which period darkhast applications should be put in.

But the Government decided in 1906 that a settlement of kumaki lands was unnecessary.

In October 1925, the Secretary Board of Revenue at the instance of the Collector of South Kanara again raised the question whether the kumaki privileges should be continued during resettlement, and stated that the Board would have the question re-examined in the light of present day conditions if the Government did not regard the question as finally settled, and would be prepared to consider it afresh. H.M. C_2 agreed with the Board to have the question re-investigated.

In B.P.No.163 Mis., dated 22-1-1926, the Board of Revenue, directed the settlement officer to examine the question and submit a report. The C.F. contains the S.S.O's report, with the Collector's remarks and the Board's suggestions.

The S.S.O. states that the existence of kumaki causes considerable complications in the accounts that it involves extra work for the survey and settlement depts. and that it necessitates annual inspection by the Revenue officials to find out whether any crops have been raised on kumaki lands. He therefore proposed that these lands might be assessed at a flat rate of 4 annas per acre, and included in patta. The Collector, however, stated that the weight of public opinion is against the assessment of kumaki lands. In this connection the L.C. Question No.2408 asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 28-8-26 and the answer thereto and also resolution 1 of the Uppinangadi ryots association are put up.

The Collector adds that the lands if retained as kumaki will be available for assignment to the

I do not see how the Surveyor are going to save any labour by assigning kumaki land at a special rate: for every piece of kumaki land will have to be surveyed as a field distinct from the adjoining ryoti & patta lands which will not be assessed at this special rate

p 11 Lodged No 2645 1926 (P)

P.S. 9 Jan 1926 (N)

Also the amount of existing work given to the settlement party seems negligible

members of the depressed classes and to ex-military men whenever necessary.

The Board of Revenue while admitting these facts seems to prefer assessing kumaki, and has therefore suggested to the Collector that an attempt might be made to induce the wargdars to take up the kumaki lands on patta at a favourable rate of assessment. The Board has called for the opinion of the Collector on its suggestion and has communicated this as an interim report.

The reasons which weighed with the Government previously in arriving at the decision that a settlement of kumaki lands was unnecessary, were, apparently those advanced in the note of H.M.C. Mr. G. Stokes.

These points may be considered when further report from the Board is received which may be awaited.

BBW 4/12/26

S. Fazl-ul-Huq

Cr

Whether kumaki lands be available for assignment to the depressed classes & to ex-military men?

I do not think they are marginal lands. If kumaki lands are merged into the adjoining wargdars lands it will not be necessary to bring them separately as it is now?

10/12

We may remark as at (1) & (2) margin & await further report

8/12

Read 10th

What is Form A 2 in Appendix V of the B.S.O.? (See correction slip LXIII of 24.7.2 at p 61 Vol II of the B.S.O.) It has not been pasted into the B.S.O. Apparently it modifies the modifications in the draft rules for S. Kanara

To undersecy.

Form A_2 in appendix V is the same as the one on page 63 vol II of B.S.O. No separate Correction slip to Appendix V, containing ~~Form~~ form A_2 seems to have been issued yet. Form A_2 does not modify the ~~rules~~ draft rules for the South Kanara etc. which have now been embodied in the B.S.O. itself (vide paragraphs 40 pp 18-20 of the revised Standing order No 18)

29.12.26

MA
17.12.26.

20/12/26

5

To Under Secretary

With reference to the Secretary's orders on page 5 above, the file was taken to him and he ordered that the question 'how can the Kumaki lands be available for assignment to the depressed classes & ex military men' be examined with reference to the standing orders.

B.S.O 15 (38) lays down the rules for the reservation of lands for assignment to the depressed classes. The instructions in G.O.No. 1576 Rev dy 10-10-24 require that lands available for assignment to ex military men should be reserved. No mention is made of the Kumaki lands in the rules.

In the case of Kumaki lands (Waste lands within Kumaki limits of Wargs the accepted view of Kumaki seems to be that it is no more than a privileged use of Govt lands adjacent to a Cultivation

Paragraph 10 of B.So 15 (40) lays down

V

~~The pattadar or mulgeni tenant who is entitled to kumaki prevereges over any portion of the land applied~~

Ken there is an application to assign kumaki land on darkhast, the practice ems to be to assign it to the Cultivator mulgeni tenant. Thereupon the kumaki ill become extinguished since the land s no longer Government waste but patta land of the mulgenidar.

Para 10 of paragraph 40 of B.S.O lays down as follows:

"The pattadar (mulgar) or mulgeni tenant who is entitled to kumaki privileges over any portion of the land applied for should be given preference over all other applicants to the extent of those privileges"

It seems clear that the kumaki land if it is retained as kumaki cannot be available for assignment to depressed lasses and ex military men ~~without giving a chance to the~~ ~~Pattidar~~ ~~mulgeni tenant~~ in preference to the

Please show the authority for this

31.1.47

authority vide Sattvam

31.1.47

Page 19 of Cor slip to B.S.O 15

The B.S.O. appears to mean that preference should be given to the Kumakidar. But, if a Kumakidar is actually enjoying Kumaki privileges (grazing his cattle, cutting leaves and twigs from trees) on a plot of Kumaki land which is not occupied for purposes of cultivation by anybody, it would hardly be proper to pass an order assigning that plot to someone else, thereby giving to the assignee an opportunity of rendering the Kumaki privileges invalid.

22/1.27

S

Quite so. And so Kumaki cannot be made available for assignment to the D.C. or the military. See marginal note on f.s.w. Show today please

31.1.27

Foundsey

Please see H'Ns orders on page 5 above. A draft O/M to the Board of Revs submitted for approval.

2/ The further report from the Board has been received, and will be found at pp. 9–13 C/F.

Reference is solicited to item 3 d ⊛ page 10 C/F. ~~wherein the Collector has~~ in which the Collector has again stated that Kumakidars will not be given any preferential treatment in cases where Kumaki is required for assignment to depressed classes etc

3/ ~~Kompara~~ S (ii) of DO reference. It will be seen that the Board is consulting the Chief Conservator of Forests whether the value of the sandal wood trees on Kumaki lands should be waived or not.

It is ~~for orders whether~~ the O/M may issue After the Board's reply to the O/M. ~~is received~~ and ~~the further report summarised in para 5(ii) of the~~

How can two pieces of land assessed at different rates be subdivisions of the same survey field?

To under Secy.

Please see the Secy's marginal note on page 10 above.

The revenue unit of a field, ie the unit for purposes of assessment is only the subdivision and not a survey field. A survey field is merely a unit for convenience in survey. It is not necessary that all the subdivisions of a survey field should be of the same description (ie wet or dry garden etc) or bear the same rate of assessment. [illegible] portion marked A in paragraph 5 of G.O. no. 1304 Rev & 9.6.1911

MRR 16.2.27

HA 15.2.27.

ASR 16.2.27

S

Will U.S. please speak. I think draft might with advantage be

Sd. -?

Revised draft

MRR 22.2.27

S

For approval

Sd.

C.S.

Issued as O.M. No. 2821 E. 26-1826.27 to the Board of Rev (LR+S)

Extract of H Ms note on C. No. 714 E. 27

"Will the proposals form part of the Settlement? If so why are they sent up in advance? The next thing will be that we will be asked to publish them for criticism before passing orders"

Take to the linked file and then note

January 1926 the S.S.O was asked by the Board to submit a report through the Collector He sent up his report on which the Board made a reference to the Govt

But the Board has reported recently (Feb. 1927) that it considers that all work connected with the assignment of kumaki including the settlement of disputes among the kumakidars should be done by the Revenue Dept, and that a period of one year may be allowed within which inquiries

The Board also proposes that special rates suggested for Kumaki lands should be liable revision only at the settlem after the next.

With the remark relating Survey, it is sec. to point out (1) That the Govt. have a said that they do not unde how the proposal will lighten work of the Surveyors

(2) That the Govt. have not sanctioned the resurvey of the talukas in the S. Kanara District (except the coast talu

It appears, therefore, that the proposals need not form pa of the Resettlement.

MMM 15.3.27

S

The Board evidently intend that kumki lands should be assigned by independently of the resettlement by ordinary district Revenue staff: but wants the survey of the assigned kum to be done by the Survey staff. I am a

The Board's proposals are
that the Kumki lands should be
gazetted ~~before~~ independently of the
settlement and by the ordinary district
revenue staffs ; and
that the survey of the Kumki lands
& assignees should be done by the
survey party.
It is submitted that it is not clear what
by the Board contemplates. If the
are to surveyed by the survey
, the ~~not~~ work of assignment will
attended to in the ordinary course by the
settlement party and the intervention of the ordinary
revenue ~~department~~ staff of the district merely for assignment
is seem to be unnecessary. If, on the
hand the assignment is to be done by
ordinary revenue ~~department~~ staff, it is not clear why or how
survey and sub-division should or can be
by the survey party.
Important & difficult questions are likely to arise
~~up~~ in connection with the assignment
Kumki lands and it is doubtful whether
survey department can deal with
adequately. It is for orders whether
Board of Revenue may be asked
report in detail exactly what

it contemplates.

AHR
2.4.27. May pros. be circulated to HMC2
w.e.r. his note on p. 12 n.f.
MMR 5/4.27

S

Please see what from p 12 n.f. I would like to speak to HMC2 about this

10.4.27

Discussed with HMC2. If "kumaki lands" are to be assigned wholesale to S. Kanara, the work can profitably be done only during the course of the Resettlement by the Settlement Officer to whom a party of Surveyors for the survey demarcation of the land assigned would have to be attached. The question is thus one for consideration as part of the Resettlement scheme & should be dealt with in the scheme itself.

Draft - fully recast

To Under Secy

A draft order is submitted for approval MRV 4.5.27

P.K.
30/4/27

Issue

Clue file.
A. note Satyas.
MRA
13.5.27.

The following is an extract from the notes in C.No.714 E/27.

x x

The proposals cover all the points raised in the questions below except the one in the first part of clause (e) regarding the waiving of the sub-division fees in connection with the assignment of kumaki lands. This point will be considered in the file below.

A.S.R.
26-2-27.

D.D.M.
28-2-27.

I.F.H.
28-2-27.

Sectt. II-5 (δ)—6,004—25-11-25. (6)

	Date.	Initials.
When received for Fair-copying.		
When copied ..		
When examined ..		
When signed ..		
When despatched ..		

Revenue DEPARTMEN

READ AGAIN G.O. No. , dated 192

" " " " 192

READ ALSO :—

C. No.537 E From the Board of Rev., L.R. & S., No. F.5868/26, dated 5 -2- 192 7.

" " " " Memo. to the Board of Rev. L.R. & S. " 2821/E/26 " 26 -2- 192 7.

" " " " " " 192

ORDER.

No. 865, dated 7 5 192 7.

Mis.

The Board of Revenue has sub

mitted the report of the S.S.O. No.IV

Party on the question of the continuar

of "kumaki" privileges in the S. Kanar

district with the remarks of the Colle

tor and with its suggestions. The Boa

of Revenue is of opinion that the exis

tence of the "kumaki" privileges cause

much inconvenience and that an attempt

should be made to induce the wargdars

to take up their ~~adjoining~~ "kumaki

lands" on patta at a favouraole rate,

a limited time. The Board of Revenue considers

(i) that all work connected with the assignment of "kumakis" Pands" including the settlement of disputes among the kumakidars should be done by the Revenue Department independently of re-settlement and

(ii) that the survey of the "kumaki lands" to be assigned should be done by the Survey Department.

2. It is not clear what exactly the Board of Revenue contemplates. If the lands are surveyed by the Survey Party, the work of assignment will be attended to in the ordinary course by the Settlement Party and the intervention of the ordinary revenue staff of the district seems unnecessary. If on the other hand the assignment is to be done by the ordinary revenue staff, it is not clear why or how the survey and sub-division should or can be done by

difficult questions are likely to arise in connection with the assignment of kumaki land and the Survey Department can not deal with them adequately. The Government therefo consider that if "kumaki lands" are to be assinged wholesale in South Kanara, the work can properly be done only during the course of the resettl ment by the Settlement Officer to wh a party of Surveyors for the survey and the demarcation of the land assigned would have to be attached. The question is therefore one for consideration as part of the resettle ment scheme and the Board of Revenue is requested to deal with it in detai in the scheme report for the resettle ment of the South Kanara district.